

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

CECELIA ANN DIXON, an individual,

Plaintiff,

vs.

**PACIFIC LIFE INSURANCE
COMPANY, and DOES I through X,
inclusive,**

Defendant.

Case No. 2:21-cv-00172 ART-BNW

**ORDER APPROVING
STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME
TO FILE REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT**

[First Request]

Defendant Pacific Life Insurance Company (“Pacific Life”) and Plaintiff Cecilia Ann Dixon (“Plaintiff”) hereby stipulate and request that the Court extend Pacific Life’s time to file its Reply to Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment, which is due **Wednesday, July 27, 2022**, by five (5) days to **Monday, August 1, 2022**. In support of this stipulation and request, the following is provided:

1. On or about November 30, 2020, Plaintiff filed an action against Pacific Life entitled *Cecelia Ann Dixon v. Pacific Life Ins. Co. and Does I through X, inclusive*, in the District Court of Clark County, Nevada, Department 2, case no. A-20-825574-C [ECF No. 1 – Exh. A];
2. On February 1, 2021, Pacific Life filed its Notice of Removal to this Court [ECF No. 1];
3. On February 8, 2021, Pacific Life filed its Answer to Plaintiff’s Complaint [ECF No. 5];
4. On June 17, 2022, Pacific Life filed a Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF No. 35];
5. Plaintiff’s Response to Pacific Life’s Motion for Summary Judgment was originally due on July 8, 2022, but Pacific Life agreed to a five-day extension through July 13, 2022, provided that Plaintiff would also agree to a five-day extension for Defendant to file its Reply brief;

6. On July 13, 2022, Plaintiff filed her Response to Pacific Life's Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF No. 37];

7. Pacific Life's deadline to file its Reply In Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment is July 27, 2022;

8. Pacific Life's counsel is requesting an extension until **Monday, August 1, 2022** to file its Reply In Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment;

9. This extension is requested due to the complexity of issues raised in Plaintiff's Response and the availability of Pacific Life's counsel and witnesses;

10. Counsel for Plaintiff does not oppose the requested extension;

11. This is the first request by Pacific Life for an extension of time to file Pacific Life's Reply In Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment, which is made in good faith and not for purposes of delay.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: July 26, 2022.

/s/ Laura M. Zulick

Karl O. Riley (Nevada Bar No. 12077)

Laura M. Zulick (pro hac vice)

COZEN O'CONNOR, P.C.

3753 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Ste. 200

Las Vegas, NV 89169

Telephone: (702) 470-2314

koriley@cozen.com

lzulick@cozen.com

Attorney for Defendant Pacific Life

Insurance Company

/s/ Travis E. Shetler

Travis E. Shetler (Nevada Bar No. 4747)

3202 W. Charleston Blvd.

Las Vegas, NV 89102

Telephone: (702) 931-9700

travis@shetlerlawfirm.com

Attorney for Plaintiff Cecilia Ann Dixon

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 28, 2022


ANNE R. TRAUM

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE